

REMARKS

In the October 29, 2004 Office Action, the Examiner objected to claims 21 and 33 because the Examiner was unclear as to what applicant regards as the claims "at least one tube." Applicant believes this confusion was due to the use of the term "distal" in the claim instead of "proximal." Accordingly, Applicant has amended the claims to change the term "distal" to "proximal" in appropriate places in the claims. Applicant believes that this change throughout the claims makes it clear that in the preferred embodiments disclosed in the specification, the claimed "at least one tube" is shown as element 38 in FIG. 2 of the application. The Examiner additionally noted that claim 25 appears to have the proximal and distal ends interchanged. The Examiner is correct in this regard, and Applicant has amended claim 25 accordingly.

The Examiner rejected claims 21-23, 25, 29, 30, 32 and 33 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,951,514 to Sahota. Applicant respectfully traverses the Examiner's rejection.

Claims 22-32 ultimately depend from claim 21, which has as an element a first one of the inflatable sections extending to a distal end of the body member and a second of the inflatable sections extending to a proximal end of the body member. Sahota does not disclose or suggest such inflatable sections extending to the proximal and distal ends of the body member. In fact, Sahota specifically states that the inflatable sections should not extend to the end as the portion extending beyond the inflatable sections at the distal end is used to guide the Sahota catheter into the patient. For at least this reason, claims 22-32 are allowable over Sahota.

Additionally, Applicant does not see how claim 22, which recites that the body member is a sleeve, can be anticipated by Sahota, which by its express terms, relates to a fixed wire catheter in which the balloon is mounted directly on the wire. (See, Sahota, col. 4, lines 22-23 and 36-38.)

Claim 33, which is similar to claim 21 with the exception of the inflatable sections extending along substantially all of the length of the body member rather than the claim

language referenced above, likewise is distinguishable from Sahota As the inflatable members of Sahota do not extend along substantially all of the length of the body member.

Applicant additionally has added new claim 34, which incorporates the optical scope or fiber language of claims 24, 26-28 and 31 that the Examiner indicated would be allowable into an independent claim.

Conclusion

For at least the foregoing reasons, Applicant respectfully submits that the present patent application is in condition for allowance. An early indication of the allowability of the present patent application is therefore respectfully solicited.

If the Examiner believes that a telephone conference with the undersigned would expedite passage of the present patent application to issue, he is invited to call on the number below.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any underpayment of fees or refund any overpayment of fees in connection with this Response to Deposit Account 50-2837.

Respectfully submitted,

DEWITT ROGGIN PLLC

By: 

Timothy R. DeWitt
Registration No. 35,857

DeWitt Roggin PLLC
12 E. Lake Dr.
Annapolis, MD 21403
Tel: 410-212-2539
Fax: 410-295-5096

Date: January 5, 2005